

Amendments to the Drawings

Attached are five (5) replacement drawing sheets for the application. The new drawings sheets contain formal drawings for the application and replace the informal drawings filed with the application. The formal drawings do not amend the drawings or introduce new matter.

Attachment: Five (5) replacement drawing sheets containing formal drawings for the application

REMARKS

At the outset, the applicants and the undersigned thank the examiner for the interview held July 12, 2007 during which the invention and the cited prior art were discussed.

Claims

In the Office Action, claims 1-4, 12, 19-22, 30, 32-35, 43, and 45 were rejected as being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) by U.S. Patent 7,188,317 to Hazel. Claims 5-11, 14-18, 23-29, and 36-42 were rejected as being obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Hazel in view of U.S. Patent 6,338,067 to Baker. Claims 13, 31, and 44 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but otherwise allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Claim 1 is directed to an interactive user interface. Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the first field lists a “focal item company,” and that the second field “comprises a listing identifying companies that are a supplier to the focal item company that receive a threshold percentage of their revenue through sales to the focal item company...” Claim 1 also recites that certain of the suppliers listed in the second field (e.g., one or more of them) include hyperlinks that, when activated by the user, cause the supplier associated with the activated hyperlink to become the new focal item in the first field, such that the second field transitions to suppliers of the new focal item company that receive a threshold percentage of their revenue through sales to the new focal item company. Accordingly, a user could interactively navigate through the supply chain for a company to ascertain, for example, key interdependencies that may be valuable in providing timely investing advice. For example, in various embodiments, the user could navigate three or more derivatives up, down, or across the supply chain very quickly and discern the impact of market moves on players several orders down or upstream.

Neither Hazel nor Baker teach or suggest these features of amended claim 1. The Hazel patent describes a dynamic multiple window display. As recognized in the Office Action, Hazel does not disclose (1) a focal item field (or window) that identifies a company or (2) a second field that lists suppliers to the company in the focal item field that receive a threshold percentage of their revenue through sales to the focal item company. *See* Office Action at p.7. Therefore, Hazel does not anticipate amended claim 1.

Claim 1 is also not obvious in view of the combination of Hazel and Baker. In order to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met: (1) there must be some suggestion or motivation to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings; (2) there must be a reasonable expectation of success; and (3) the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. In formulating a rejection under § 103(a) based upon a combination of prior art elements, the Office must identify the reason why a person of ordinary skill in the art would have combined the prior art elements in the manner claimed. *See* Memo by Margaret A. Focarino, Deputy Commissioner for Patent Operations, May 3, 2007. Here, among other things, the Hazel and Baker references fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations of amended claim 1.

As mentioned above, the Office has already recognized that the Hazel patent fails to disclose several elements of claim 1, including (1) a focal item field (or window) that identifies a company or (2) a second field that lists suppliers to the company in the focal item field that receive a threshold percentage of its revenue through sales to the focal item company. Baker also does not disclose or suggest these features.

Baker discloses a product hierarchy database that organizes company market performance and stock investment information by the products and services produced and

offered by each competitor. For example, the product hierarchy described in Baker may identify the various components used to make a top level product, and the companies that make the various components (*see, e.g.*, Baker at col. 9:57 to col. 10:25), but Baker nowhere describes its database as including data on which suppliers of the components to a maker of a top level product receive a threshold percentage of their revenue through sales to the maker of the top level product. The Office Action cites to col. 8, lines 32-42 of Baker as purportedly showing this feature. *See* Office Action at p.8. A reading of this passage, however, clearly shows that Baker's database does not include data on which suppliers of the components to a maker of a top level product receive a threshold percentage of their revenue through sales to the maker of the top level product. In addition, while Baker discloses that "[r]evenue percentage figures can be attached to every one of a company's products" (*see* Baker at col. 13:3-4), this is different from data regarding sales revenue for a suppliers to a particular company. In Baker, the revenue for a particular company product may be come from sales to numerous buyers. Also, Baker fails to take into account that a particular supplier may sell many of its products to one buyer. Baker, therefore, fails to highlight the critical business interdependencies that may exist between a particular supplier and buyer due to the high percentage of revenue that the supplier may receive from sales to the buyer. An interface, per embodiments of the present invention, that quickly and interactively provides such information is an unexpected result and a great tool for financial analysts seeking to make provide rapid but informed analysis in the face of breaking financial news.

Therefore, Hazel and Baker fail to teach or suggest all of the elements of amended claim 1, which is one of the three basic criteria of a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Simply put, a person having skill in the art would not be motivated to realize the invention of amended claim 1

in view of the combination of Hazel and Baker. Therefore, amended claim 1 and its dependent claims (*see* MPEP § 2143.03) are not obvious in view of Hazel and Baker.

Several claims formerly depending from claim 1, including claims 5, 7, 8, 10, and 13, have been cancelled. Also, several claims depending from claim 1 recite additional features that distinguish the cited references. For example, amended dependent claim 9 recites that the interface comprises a third field that lists customers of the focal item company from which the focal item company receives a threshold percentage of its revenue. Neither Hazel nor Baker teach or suggest this feature.

Independent claims 14, 19, and 33 have been amended in a manner similar to claim 1. Therefore, for reasons analogous to those set forth above, applicants submits that claims 14, 19, and 33, as well as their respective dependent claims, are (i) not anticipated by Hazel, and (ii) not obvious in view of the combination of Hazel and Baker.

New claims 46-48 essentially correspond to objected-to claims 13, 31 and 44 rewritten in independent form. Claims 13, 31 and 44 have been cancelled.

New claim 49 is similar to amended claim 1, except that whereas the second field in amended claim 1 lists supplier of the focal item company, the second field in claim 49 lists customers of the focal item company from which the focal item company receives a threshold percentage of its revenue. Neither Hazel nor Baker disclose these elements of claim 49; therefore, claim 49 is patentable in view of the cited references.

New claim 50 is similar to claim 49 and is patentable in view of the cited references for analogous reasons.

Drawings

Applicants have enclosed five (5) replacement drawing sheets for the application that contain formal drawings to replace the informal drawings filed with the application. The formal drawings do not amend the drawings or introduce new matter

Information Disclosure Statement Filed

Applicants note that it filed an Information Disclosure Statement on May 21, 2007, which the Office should consider with this response.

CONCLUSION


Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims presented in the present application, as either amended or initially presented in this Amendment, are in condition for allowance. Applicants' present Amendment should not in any way be taken as acquiescence to any of the specific assertions, statements, etc., presented in the Office Action not explicitly addressed herein. Applicants reserve the right to specifically address all such assertions and statements in subsequent responses.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to properly respond to the Office Action and believe that the claims are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any remaining

concerns, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below so that such concerns may be expeditiously addressed.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 17, 2007



Mark G. Knedeisen
Reg. No. 42,747

KIRKPATRICK & LOCKHART PRESTON GATES ELLIS, LLP
Henry W. Oliver Building
535 Smithfield Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15222

Ph. (412) 355-6342
Fax (412) 355-6501

Attachments